



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,781	09/30/2003	Conor P. Cahill	06975-446001	6538
26171	7590	01/10/2008	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			VU, KIEU D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2173		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/10/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

3

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/675,781	CAHILL, CONOR P.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Kieu D. Vu	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 and 38-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 and 38-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Reply filed on 10/27/07.
2. Claims 1-36 and 38-46 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-15, 18-28, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick (US 7,136,849), Kenig (US 20040189693), and DiAngelo (US 5977969).

Regarding claims 1, 25, 35, Patrick teaches a method for displaying a uniform resource locator (URL), the method comprising accessing a URL corresponding to a link presented for selection to a user (col. 2, lines 14-18) and identifying a portion of the URL that corresponds to a hostname component of the URL (identifying the link's URL domain, col. 2, lines 17-18). Patrick further teaches displaying the link and visually distinguishing external links (see Fig. 1a-1c) (see col. 3, lines 23-49). Patrick does not teach displaying the URL corresponding to the link. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Kenig. Kenig teaches displaying a URL corresponding the link (object 232 is visually displayed showing the domain name corresponding for the selected IP address, [0045], Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick and Kenig before him at the time the invention

was made, to modify the interface for displaying external links taught by Patrick to include visually displaying the domain name taught by Kenig with the motivation being to provide the user with the domain name of the external link to help the user decide if the user chooses to visit the external link. Patrick and Kenig do not teach visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by DiAngelo. DiAngelo teaches displaying a URL where the hostname component is visually distinguished from other components of the URL (see Fig. 3D). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick, Kenig, and DiAngelo before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying external links taught by Patrick and Kenig to include visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL taught by DiAngelo with the motivation being to enable the user to quickly and conveniently identify hostname component among other URL components.

Regarding claim 2, Patrick, as modified by Kenig, teaches the link is presented contemporaneously with the electronic document (Patrick, Fig. 1a-1c) (Kenig, Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 3, Patrick teaches wherein a software application used to display the electronic document automatically identifies the portion of the URL that corresponds to the hostname component of the URL (col 3, lines 23-31).

Regarding claim 4, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches wherein the hostname component of the URL is visually distinguished from other components of the URL when a pointer is positioned over the link in the electronic document (Patrick,

see Fig. 1a-1c, see col. 3, lines 11-13 and 23-49) (Kenig, [0045], Fig. 2) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 5, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches wherein the hostname component of the URL is visually distinguished from other components of the URL when the link is selected (Patrick, see Fig. 1a-1c, see col. 1, lines 45-49, col. 3, lines 11-13 and 23-49) (Kenig, [0045], Fig. 2) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 6, Patrick, as modified by Kenig, teaches wherein the link is selected through manipulation of a pointing device (Patrick, see Fig. 1a-1c, mouse cursor, see col. 3, lines 11-13 and 23-49) (Kenig, [0045], Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 7-8, Patrick teaches displaying a warning message in response to the selection of the link wherein the warning message requires a response before performing a redirection to the URL (using “visual warning” to communicate with the user to alert that the user is leaving to a different site, col. 1, lines 45-48).

Regarding claim 10, Patrick teaches the link corresponds to a selectable button in the electronic document (links in Fig. 1a-c are selectable)

Regarding claim 12, Patrick teaches the software application is selected from the group consisting of a word processing application, an electronic mail application, an instant messaging application, and a browser (col. 2, lines 37-50).

Regarding claim 13, Patrick teaches the electronic document is selected from the group consisting of a word processor file, an electronic mail message, an instant message, and a web page (Fig. 1a-1c).

Regarding claims 14 and 28, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches the hostname component of the URL is visually distinguished by using display characteristics for the hostname component that differ from display characteristics of other components of the URL (col. 3, lines 35-49) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 15, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches the display characteristics for the hostname component comprise at least one of:

a color for the hostname component that differs from a color of other components of the URL; or a font style for the hostname component that differs from a font style of other components of the URL; or a font size for the hostname component that differs from a font size of other components of the URL; or a font type for the hostname component that differs from a font type of other components of the URL; or a display effect for the hostname component (col. 3, lines 23-49) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 18, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches the URL, with the hostname component of the URL visually distinguished from other portions of the URL, is displayed in a user interface of a browser application (Patrick, Fig. 1a-c, col. 3, lines 23-49) (Kenig, Fig. 2) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 19, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches wherein the URL, with the hostname component of the URL visually distinguished from other portions of the URL, is displayed in an address field of the browser application user interface (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 20, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches wherein the URL, with the hostname component of the URL visually distinguished from

other portions of the URL, is displayed in a status bar of the browser application user interface. (Patrick, Fig. 1a-c, col. 3, lines 23-49, also see status bar on top of Fig 1a) (Kenig, Fig. 2) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 21, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches wherein the URL, with the hostname component of the URL visually distinguished from other portions of the URL, is displayed in the status bar of the browser application user interface when a pointer is positioned over a hyperlink displayed by the browser application (Patrick, Fig. 1a-c, col. 3, lines 23-49, also see status bar on top of Fig 1a) (Kenig, Fig. 2) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claims 22 and 32, Patrick teaches the hostname component of the URL comprises at least a second level domain name (Patrick, sub-domain, col. 3, lines 35-49).

Regarding claims 23 and 33, Patrick, Kenig, and DiAngelo do not teach wherein the hostname component of the URL comprises at least a portion of the URL that follows an "@" symbol in the URL. However, the hostname component of the URL comprises at least a portion of the URL that follows an "@" symbol in the URL is known in the art (for example: email address). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick, Kenig, and DiAngelo before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying external links taught by Patrick to include hostname component of the URL comprises at least a portion of the URL that follows an "@" symbol in the URL so that email addresses can be analyzed by Patrick's software.

Regarding claims 24 and 34, Patrick teaches wherein the hostname component of the URL comprises the first and second level domain names (see domain and sub-domain in col. 3, lines 23-49).

Regarding claim 26, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches causing one or more processors to perform further operations comprising: receiving a user selection of the link; and displaying the URL on the user interface, with the hostname component of the URL visually distinguished from other components of the URL, in response to the user selection of the hyperlink (Patrick, see Fig. 1a-1c, see col. 3, lines 11-13 and 23-49) (Kenig, [0045], Fig. 2) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

Regarding claim 27, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches wherein the link is displayed on the user interface and the user selection of the link comprises one of receiving an indication that a pointer is positioned over the link or receiving an indication that the link is selected through manipulation of a pointing device (Patrick, see Fig. 1a-1c, mouse cursor, see col. 3, lines 11-13 and 23-49) (Kenig, [0045], Fig. 2) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

5. Claims 9, 11, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick (US 7,136,849), Kenig (US 20040189693), DiAngelo (US 5977969). and Jones et al (hereinafter "Jones", US 5961591).

Regarding claims 9 and 31, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, teaches displaying warning message alerting user that the user is leaving the current site (col. 1, lines 44-49), but Patrick does not teach displaying the warning message, only if the URL is determined to be suspicious. Jones teaches obtaining rating for a web page (Fig. 8)

and displaying a warning message to alert the user about characteristics of the web page to be displayed (see message 531 in Fig. 5) (see col. 6, lines 2-22 and 47-54, Fig. 5-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick and Jones before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying warning when connecting to external links taught by Patrick to include displaying a warning message to alert the user about characteristics of the web page to be displayed taught by Jones with the motivation being to provide the user with specific information on the characteristics of the external site to be displayed.

Regarding claim 11, Patrick, as modified by Kenig, DiAngelo, and Jones, teaches wherein a software application automatically determines whether the URL is suspicious and visually distinguishes the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL only if the URL is determined to be suspicious (Patrick, see Fig. 1a-1c, see col. 1, lines 45-49, col. 3, lines 11-13 and 23-49) (Kenig, [0045], Fig. 2) (Jones, see message 531 in Fig. 5, see col. 6, lines 2-22 and 47-54, Fig. 5-6) (DiAngelo, Fig. 3D).

6. Claims 16-17 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick (US 7,136,849), Kenig (US 20040189693), DiAngelo (US 5977969) and Kubala (US 2004/0169685).

Regarding claims 16 and 29, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and DiAngelo, does not teach the hostname component of the URL is visually distinguished by repositioning the hostname component. Kubala teaches a method for alerting user about a site the user is going to visit when the hypertext link is selected, the method further repositions the link name (see “David’s Bikes” link (306a) in Fig. 3, also see [0027]). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick, Kenig, and Kubala before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying warning when connecting to external links taught by Patrick and Kenig to include repositioning hostname component (link) taught by Kubala with the motivation being to alert the user with specific information on the characteristics of the external site to be displayed.

Regarding claim 17, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and Kubala, teaches redisplaying the hostname component at the beginning of the displayed URL (Kubala, see “David’s Bikes” link (306a) in Fig. 3, also see [0027])(Kenig, Fig. 2, [0045]).

Regarding claim 30, Patrick, as modified by Kenig and Kubala, teaches displaying the hostname component in isolation (Kubala, see “David’s Bike” redisplayed in pop-up 304a, Fig. 3).

7. Claims 36, 38, 40, and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick (US 7,136,849) and Jones et al (hereinafter “Jones”, US 5961591) and Hartselle (US 20030131060).

Regarding claim 36, Patrick teaches a method for displaying a uniform resource locator (URL), the method comprising accessing a URL corresponding to a link presented for selection to a user (col. 2, lines 52-58) (Fig. 1a-c); identifying a portion of a URL that corresponds to a hostname component of the URL (col. 1, lines 20-43, col. 3, lines 23-49); and displaying a warning message relating to the hostname component of the URL (using “visual warning” to communicate with the user to alert that the user is leaving to a different site, col. 1, lines 45-48). Patrick teaches displaying warning

message alerting user that the user is leaving the current site (col. 1, lines 44-49), but Patrick does not teach determining that the URL is suspicious wherein displaying the warning message is performed in response to the determination. Jones teaches obtaining rating for a web page (Fig. 8) and displaying a warning message to alert the user about characteristics of the web page to be displayed (see message 531 in Fig. 5) (see col. 6, lines 2-22 and 47-54, Fig. 5-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick and Jones before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying warning when connecting to external links taught by Patrick to include displaying a warning message to alert the user about characteristics of the web page to be displayed taught by Jones with the motivation being to provide the user with specific information on the characteristics of the external site to be displayed. Patrick in view of Jones does not teach identifying at least one other portion of the URL that corresponds to other components of the URL; determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the hostname component and the other components. Hartselle teaches teach identifying at least one other portion of the URL that corresponds to other components of the URL; determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the hostname component and the other components ([0045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick and Hartselle before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying warning when connecting to external links taught by Patrick to include determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an

analysis of the hostname component and the other components taught by Hartselle with the motivation being to enhance the efficiency in recognizing suspicious web pages.

Regarding claim 38, Patrick, as modified by Jones, teaches requiring a user to acknowledge the hostname component of the URL before providing access to an electronic file identified by the URL (Jones, password is required to see the site, see message 532 in Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 40, Patrick teaches wherein a software application automatically identifies the portion of the URL that corresponds to the hostname component of the URL (col. 2, lines 37-57).

Regarding claim 43, Patrick teaches wherein the warning message is displayed in response to a selection of the link (“visual warning to the user that they are leaving the current site”, col. 1, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 44, Patrick, as modified by Jones and Hartselle, teaches wherein determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the other components includes determining a position of the hostname component relative to the other components (Hartselle, [0045]).

Regarding claim 45, Patrick, as modified by Jones and Hartselle, teaches wherein determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the other components includes identifying at least one of the other components that resembles a hostname component (Hartselle, [0045]).

Regarding claim 46, Patrick, as modified by Jones and Hartselle, teaches determining whether the URL is suspicious by determining whether the hostname component of the URL corresponds to the information in the link (Hartselle, [0045]).

8. Claims 39, 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick (US 7,136,849), Jones et al (hereinafter “Jones”, US 5961591), Hartselle (US 20030131060), and Kenig (US 20040189693).

Regarding claim 39, Patrick, as modified by Jones and Hartselle, teaches displaying warning message upon selection of an external link (col. 1, lines 45-48) but does not teach the warning message identifies the hostname component of the URL. Kenig teaches displaying a hostname component of an URL in response to selection of a corresponding link (Fig. 2, [0045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick and Kenig before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying warning when connecting to external links taught by Patrick to include displaying the hostname component taught by Kenig with the motivation being to provide the user with more information on the external link.

Regarding claim 41, Patrick, as modified by Jones and Hartselle, teaches displaying warning message upon selection of an external link (col. 1, lines 45-48) but does not teach the warning message displays the entire URL. Kenig teaches displaying a hostname component of an URL in response to selection of a corresponding link (Fig. 2, [0045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick and Kenig before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying warning when connecting to external links taught by Patrick

to include displaying the hostname component taught by Kenig with the motivation being to provide the user with more information on the external link.

9. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick (US 7,136,849), Jones et al (hereinafter "Jones", US 5961591), Hartselle (US 20030131060), Kenig (US 20040189693), and DiAngelo

Regarding claim 42, Patrick, as modified, teaches the method of claim 41 above but fails to teach the hostname component of the URL is visually distinguished from other components of the URL. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by DiAngelo. DiAngelo teaches displaying a URL where the hostname component is visually distinguished from other components of the URL (see Fig. 3D). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Patrick and DiAngelo before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for displaying external links taught by Patrick to include visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL taught by DiAngelo with the motivation being to enable the user to quickly and conveniently identify hostname component among other URL components.

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/17/07 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues

"The DiAngelo reference does not describe visually distinguishing a hostname component of a URL from other components of a URL."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. DiAngelo teaches entering block text and further teaches visually distinguishing block text from text enter from the keyboard. DiAngelo also teaches that block text comprises hostname (domain identifier, resource identifier) (col. 2, lines 12-18). Fig. 3D of DiAngelo clearly illustrates the ability of visually distinguishing hostname component from other component.

Applicant argues that the cited references are not properly combinable. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Patrick, Kenig, and DiAngelo references are all directed to providing visual indicators relating URLs. Specifically, Patrick teaches displaying the link and visually distinguishing external links (see Fig. 1a-1c) (see col. 3, lines 23-49). Kenig teaches visually displaying a URL corresponding the link (object 232 is visually displayed showing the domain name corresponding for the selected IP address, [0045], Fig. 2). DiAngelo teaches displaying a URL where the hostname component is visually distinguished from other components of the URL (see Fig. 3D). Therefore, the Examiner respectfully argues that these references are in the same field of endeavor and the combination is proper.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA

1971).

Applicant argues

"The Hartselle reference states that if the user's home e-mail address is "user@bellsouth.com", the e-mail client application would determine whether any intended recipient's e-mail addresses are located at a domain other than "bellsouth.com". Thus, the Hartselle reference does not teach identifying at least one other portion of a URL that corresponds to other components of a URL and determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of an hostname component and other components. Instead, the Hartselle reference teaches determining if email addresses are associated with a domain other than a user's domain."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the Hartselle reference teaches determining if email addresses are associated with a domain other than a user's domain, the determination is based on the analysis of the hostname component and other component of the email addresses.

**11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4057.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at 571-272-4048.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

and / or:

571-273-4057 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kieu D. Vu

Primary Examiner